

Environmental Protection Agency

§ 52.125

date as required and allowed by sections 172(c)(2) and 189(a)(1)(B).

[38 FR 33373, Dec. 3, 1973, as amended at 48 FR 254, Jan. 4, 1983; 51 FR 3336, Jan. 27, 1986; 51 FR 33750, Sept. 23, 1986; 62 FR 41864, Aug. 4, 1997; 63 FR 28904, May 27, 1998; 63 FR 41350, Aug. 3, 1998]

§ 52.124 Part D disapproval.

(a) The following portions of the Arizona SIP are disapproved because they do not meet the requirements of Part D of the Clean Air Act.

(1) The attainment demonstration, conformity and contingency portions of the 1987 Maricopa Association of Governments Carbon Monoxide Plan and 1988 Addendum.

(2) The attainment demonstration and contingency portions of the 1987 Carbon Monoxide State Implementation Plan Revision for the Tucson Air Planning Area.

(b) Maricopa County PM-10 Non-attainment Area (Phoenix Planning Area). (1) *Plan for Attainment of the 24-hour PM-10 Standard—Maricopa County PM-10 Nonattainment Area* (May, 1997) submitted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on May 7, 1997.

(i) The Administrator disapproves the provisions for implementing RACM and BACM for the significant source categories of agricultural fields, agricultural aprons, vacant lands, unpaved parking lots, and unpaved roads.

(ii) The Administrator disapproves the attainment and reasonable further progress demonstrations for the Gilbert PM-10 monitoring site and West Chandler PM-10 monitoring site.

(iii) The disapprovals in paragraphs (f)(1) (i) and (ii) of this section are applicable only to the plan identified in paragraph (f)(1) of this section and do not constitute the Administrator's final decision as to the State's full compliance with the requirements of Clean Air Act sections 189(a)(1)(C) and 189(b)(1)(B) for RACM and BACM and sections 189(a)(1)(B), 189(b)(1)(A) and 189(c)(1) for attainment and reasonable further progress. Therefore such disapprovals do not constitute state failures for the purpose of triggering sanctions under §179(a) of the Clean Air Act.

(c) The Administrator disapproves the attainment demonstration for the annual PM-10 national ambient air quality standard and the provisions for implementation of reasonably available control measures for the annual PM-10 national ambient air quality standard in the *MAG 1991 Particulate Plan for PM-10 for the Maricopa County Area and 1993 Revisions* (July 1993) submitted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on August 11, 1993 as revised by the submittal of a Revised Chapter 9 on March 3, 1994 because they do not meet the requirements of sections 189(a)(1)(B) and 189(a)(1)(C) of Part D of title I of the Clean Air Act.

[56 FR 5478, Feb. 11, 1991, as amended at 62 FR 41864, Aug. 4, 1997; 63 FR 41350, Aug. 3, 1998]

§ 52.125 Control strategy and regulations: Sulfur oxides.

(a)(1) The requirements of subpart G of this chapter are not met since the control strategy does not analyze the impact of smelter fugitive emissions on ambient air quality (except at Hayden, Arizona) in the Central Arizona Intrastate, the Pima Intrastate, and the Southeast Arizona Intrastate (Cochise and Greenlee counties) Regions. Arizona must submit these smelter fugitive emissions control strategies to EPA by August 1, 1984. In addition, the requirements of §51.281 of this chapter are not met since the plan does not require permanent control of fugitive smelter emissions necessary to attain and maintain the national standards for sulfur oxides. The control strategy for Hayden shows that these controls are required to attain and maintain the national standards, and the fugitive control strategy analyses required above may show that they are required for some or all of the other smelter towns in Arizona. Arizona must submit all fugitive emissions control regulations necessary to attain and maintain the national standards for sulfur oxides to EPA by August 1, 1984. Therefore, the control strategies and regulations for the six smelter areas in the Central Arizona Intrastate, the Pima Intrastate and the Southeast Arizona Intrastate (Cochise and Greenlee counties)